DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 389 FL 027 802

AUTHOR	Jenks, Christopher J.
TITLE	Process Writing Checklist.
PUB DATE	2003-06-00
NOTE	9p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom - Teacher (052) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Check Lists; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Higher Education; *Process Approach (Writing); Second Language Learning; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Writing Instruction; Writing Processes; *Writing Skills; *Writing Strategies

ABSTRACT

This checklist is designed to help develop writing strategies for English language learners (ELLs), focusing on a variety of linguistic strategies inherent in the writing process. It provides them with a graphical representation of the cognitive process involved in complex writing, promoting self-assessment strategies and integrating oral activities, graphic organizers, literacy tasks, writing workshops, and publishing goals into a self-assessment tool. The writing process is categorized in a five-stage sequential pattern (prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing). The process writing checklist acknowledges the importance of activating background knowledge through exploratory activities native to the prewriting state. The drafting, revising, and editing phases of process writing integrate the procedural and structural knowledge critical to successful writing. The composition tasks associated with the publishing stage unite the content, procedural, and structural knowledge central to developing authentic and effective writing assessment activities. Self-assessment methodologies empower ELLs with the confidence and skills necessary for literacy development. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 389

Process Writing Checklist

Christopher J. Jenks

George Mason University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christopher Jenks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 082 780

Process Writing Checklist

Linguistic Objectives

The current assessment paper aims to develop writing strategies for English language learner (ELL) students. The focal point of analysis epitomizes a variety of linguistic strategies inherent in the writing process. Consequently, proficiency in oral communicative functions (i.e., BICS) is a crucial linguistic prerequisite essential for participation and project completion. The primary objective of process writing is to promote self-assessment strategies for ELL students—successful completion of such an academic endeavor is efficiently realized by delivering process writing for ELL students with intermediate proficient levels. Oral activities (e.g., classroom discussions and peer response groups), graphic organizers (e.g., concept maps), literacy tasks (e.g., free writing), writing workshops (e.g., sentence combining), and publishing goals (e.g., school books) will be integrated within the present self-assessment tool to facilitate and promote the writing skills necessary for academic success.

Assessment Analysis

The writing process is categorized in a 5-stage sequential pattern (i.e., the prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing phase). Although numerous educational strategies have been developed specifically for each writing stage, the literacy strategies and skills implemented in the current paper can be easily adapted or omitted to suit the academic needs of individual learners (see Appendix). The prewriting phase entails a classroom discussion and brainstorming activity on an idea, topic, or concept in which a literacy objective will commence the writing task (the literacy objective should be to cultivate creative ideas and establish students' background knowledge). Any form of graphic organizers can be integrated in conjunction with the prewriting phase to bridge knowledge gaps. The drafting phase involves a

free writing, concept mapping, and an outline activity to generate ideas and establish a purposeful foundation (ELL students sole concern is to transfer cognitive information to a tangible outline). Peer response groups and teacher conferences represent the revising phase of process writing (the literacy objective for the revising stage is to convey meaning and little attention should be placed on grammatical corrections). Conversely, a workshop in improving syntactic aptitude and grammatical functions (e.g., sentence combining) will assist ELL students in the editing phase—once again, the literacy activities discussed in the current paper are examples and should be utilized only if they represent the academic objective of your classroom. The publishing phase concludes the writing process task with computer finalization, journal entry, and concept distribution (establishing a publishing source in process writing will produce literacy activities that are meaningful to the students). The assessment framework in which the preceding writing segments are confined under illustrates the structural components of a checklist design. Although the current self-assessment tool illustrates a specific didactic purpose (i.e., to promote individual literacy strategies towards an individual writing product), ELL students and English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instructors should be encouraged to utilize additional forms of learning strategies. Variations to the present assessment tool can be easily modified to the learning objectives of most classrooms (e.g., altering the linguistic components of a writing workshop for advanced ELL students).

Modifications & Linguistic Objectives

A paramount learning objective of the current assessment tool encompasses the explicit understanding of writing procedures. Transparent (i.e., unauthentic) instruction towards writing products reflects inefficient literacy approaches—whilst the monitoring skills central to process writing are efficient and effective linguistic approaches to literacy success (Peregoy & Boyle,

2000). Therefore, ELL students must be adequately confident and competent in the literacy strategies intrinsic to process writing—the saliency within the former linguistic objective formulates the assessment construction in which five linguistic modifications emerge (i.e., the individual learning components promoted through each stage of the writing process complements the overall progress of successful writing). For example, the prewriting phase promotes oral development through classroom discussions. The drafting and revising phase comprises of writing activities unequivocally linked to literacy development. Aural, oral, and reading processes are enhanced in the editing phase through peer assessment. Literacy purpose and writing skills are realized by means of publishing goals and harmonizing phases.

The self-assessment checklist symbolizes conscious behaviorism in which cognitive consumption precedes phase completion (i.e., ELL students develop literacy habits and monitoring skills and as they precede through the stages of process writing). The graphic organizers and literacy activities identified in the preceding analysis represents the linguistic modifications fundamental to ELL comprehension (i.e., the strategic tools within each writing phase signifies literacy scaffolding for ELL students). The culminating goal from the former linguistic modifications cultivate metacognitive skills essential to completing writing tasks—thus, another underlying literacy objective of the current assessment tool is to establish a preliminary knowledge of writing strategies.

Rationale

Maxims of Writing

Four principal components for developing effective writing assessment activities emerge through theoretical examination. Accordingly, O'Malley & Pierce (1996) distinguishes the practical framework of process writing by identifying the components of successful writers (i.e.,

knowledge of content, procedural knowledge, knowledge of structures, and knowledge of integration). The process writing checklist acknowledges the importance of activating background knowledge through the exploratory activities native to the prewriting stage. The drafting, revising, and editing phase of process writing integrates the procedural and structural knowledge critical to successful writing (e.g., the mini-lessons inherent in the revising stage supports the mechanics of writing conventions identified in the knowledge of structure maxim). The composition tasks associated with the publishing stage of process writing unite the content, procedural, and structural knowledge central to developing authentic and effective writing assessment activities.

Theoretical Implications

Proficiency progression of literacy skills requires ELL students to carefully monitor cognitive strategies inherent in chronological writing (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996). Self-assessment methodologies empower ELL students with the confidence and skills necessary for literacy development. In addition, the monitoring characteristics of graphic organizers (e.g., checklists, K-W-L charts, and concept maps) promote the metacognitive competencies indispensable to academic growth. The current writing strategies checklist provides ELL students with a graphical representation of the cognitive process involved in complex writing. Such linguistic facilitation has the instructional authority to bridge academic and linguistic gaps prevalent in many educational systems (Baker, 2001). Furthermore, traditional forms of assessment mechanically impose pedagogical barriers for valid and reliable evaluation (Brualdi, 2002; Rudner & Schafer, 2002). Alternative forms of evaluation (e.g., self-assessment) are an effective means of eradicating such instability and ambiguity in academic growth.

Learning & Assessing

The 5-stage sequential pattern of process writing is based on the independent and associative components that measure evidence and evaluation (e.g., comprehensive analysis of linguistic development), enhance instructional procedures (e.g., accurate evaluation of linguistic applications), and provide ELL students with fair and ethical assessment designs (e.g., multiple forms of assessment opportunities in a variety of learning environments). The confidence of knowing ELL students will integrate monitoring strategies during literacy activities distributes instructional time to additional meaningful assessment applications—the efficiency and feasibility of the current self-assessment checklist allows educators to effortlessly accomplish anecdotal records and assess instructional effectiveness. Evaluating ELL students in authentic and meaningful linguistic interactions (e.g., collaborative work with the absence of test anxiety) are crucial in developing an inclusive awareness for accurate language assessment (Mallow & Patterson, 1999). Educators who provide ELL students with opportunities to engage in peer discussions foster literacy growth without communicative apprehension (i.e., ELL students participate in natural communication without the anxiety experienced through traditional assessment applications). In addition, the self-evaluative checklist of process writing explicitly forms a sequential representation to which the reading and writing skills of academic language are implicitly advanced (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996). Establishing cerebral links between background knowledge and novel literacy information will not only promote long-term memory survival, but also provide a learning environment rich in comprehensible input (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994).

Reference

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Brualdi, A. (2002). Self-efficacy conception of anxiety. In L.M. Rudner & W.D. Schafer (Eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know about Assessment* (pp. 12-15). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J.M. (1994). *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing cognitive academic language learning approach*. Redding, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Mallow, F., & Patterson, L. (1999). *Framing Literacy: Teaching/Learning in K-8 Classrooms*. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon Publishers.

O'Malley, J.M., & Pierce, L.V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical approached for teachers*. Redding, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. (2001). *Reading, Writing, & Learning in ESL*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Rudner, L.M., & Schafer, W.D. (2002). Self-efficacy conception of anxiety. In L.M. Rudner & W.D. Schafer (Eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know about Assessment* (pp. 16-20). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Appendix

Process Writing

Checklist

	Yes / No	How? Why? What?
Prewriting Phase		
Classroom Discussion	Yes / No	
Graphic Organizer	Yes / No	
Brainstorming	Yes / No	
Drafting Phase		
Free Writing	Yes / No	
Concept Maps	Yes / No	
Outlines	Yes / No	
Revising Phase		
Peer Response Group	Yes / No	
Teacher Conference	Yes / No	
Editing Phase		
Sentence Combining	Yes / No	
Writers Workshop	Yes / No	
Publishing Phase		
Computer Finalization	Yes / No	
Journal Entry	Yes / No	
Publish Medium	Yes / No	

FL027802

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Process Writing Checklist

Author(s): Christopher J. Jenks

Corporate Source: George Mason University

Publication Date: June 19, 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here please

Signature: CJ	Printed Name/Position/Title:
Organization/Address: 7401 E Moreland Rd #212 Annandale VA 22003	Telephone: 703.642.2937 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: CJjenks@hotmail.com Date: 7/28/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable

source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price Per Copy:
Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant a reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V.WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, which will forward your materials to the appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse.

Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguisitics
4646 40th Street NW
Washington, DC 20016-1859

(800) 276-9834/ (202) 362-0700
e-mail: eric@cal.org